

CHRISTIAN STATESMAN

VOL. XCH

Pittsburgh, Pa., March, 1948

No. 2

NATIONAL SOVEREIGNTY IN THE NEW AGE

(This article is taken from a recently published book, which we have read with great interest and profit and which we advise our readers to secure and read, "Modern Man is Obsolete," by Norman Cousins, published by The Viking Press, New York. National Sovereignty is an important aspect of the subject to the discussion of which this issue of The Christian Statesman is largely devoted—Editor's Note.)

On August 6, 1945, a new age was born. When on that day a parachute containing a small object floated to earth over Japan, it marked the violent death of one state in man's history and the beginning of another. Nor should it be necessary to prove the saturating effect of the new age, permeating every aspect of man's activities, from mechanics to morals, from physics to philosophy, from politics to poetry; in sum, an effect creating a blanket of obsolescence not only over the methods and products of man, but over himself. . . .

We have saved for last the most crucial aspect of this general survey, the transformation or adjustment from national man to world man. At present he is a world warrior; it is time for him to grow up and become a world citizen. This is not vaporous idealism, but sheer driving necessity. It bears directly on the prospects of his own survival. He will have to recognize the flat truth that the greatest obsolescence of all in the Atomic Age is national sovereignty. Even back in the old-fashioned Rocket Age before August 6, 1945, strict national sovereignty was an anomalous over-hold from the tribal instincts in nations. If it was anomalous then, it is preposterous now.

It is preposterous because we have invested it with non-existent powers. We assume that national sovereignty is still the same that it always was, that it still offers security and freedom of national decision. We assume it still means national independence, the right to get into war or to stay out of it. We even debate the question of surrendering some of our sovereignty—as though there is still something to surrender. There is only something to gain—a common world sovereignty.

At the heart of sovereignty throughout history there has been security based on the advantages of geography or military might. For sovereignty has been inseparable from power. But by the end of World War I, the validity of national sovereignty had been sharply changed. The development of air power alone, apart from all other aspects of the world's inexorable trend toward close interrelationship outdated traditional concepts of independence among nations. Yet we preferred to be-

lieve that there was no connection between a world being locked into a single piece, and its over-all organization. Unfortunately, our unreadiness or unwillingness to see this connection did not cause the connection to disappear.

So much did this connection exist that it led to World War II. Despite six years of that new war, despite jet planes, rocket planes, despite the abrupt telescoping of a thousand years of human history in the release of atomic energy, despite the loss of millions of lives, we still act as though sovereignty can function as it did two thousand years ago.

Can it be that we do not realize that in an age of atomic energy and rocket planes the foundations of the old sovereignties have been shattered? That no longer is security to be found in armies, and navies, however large and mighty? That no longer is there security based upon size and upon size alone? That any nation however small, is potentially as powerful as any other nation, however large? That in an Atomic Age all nations are now directly accessible to each other—for better or worse? That in the erasure of man-made barriers and boundaries all the peoples of the world stand virtually unarmed in the presence of one another? That they are at the mercy of one another, and still have to devise a common security, or suffer a common cataclysm? That the only really effective influence between peoples is such influence as they are able to exert morally, politically, ideologically upon each other? . . .

All these questions have been in the making for centuries, but the triumph over the invisible and mighty atom has given them an exactness and immediacy about which there can be no mistake. The need for world government was clear long before August 6, 1945, but Hiroshima and Nagasaki raised that need to such dimensions that it can no longer be ignored. And in the glare brighter than the sunlight produced by the assault upon the atom, we have all the light we need with which to examine this new world that has come into being with clicking abruptness. Thus examined, the old sovereignties are seen for what they are—vestigial obstructions in the circulatory system of the world.

AMERICA'S RESPONSIBILITY FOR WORLD PEACE

In these crucial days, when, due to the peril of a Third World War, the fate of humanity hangs in the balance, America among all the nations, has the greatest responsibility for the peace of the world.

She is today the most powerful of all the nations. Her material resources and wealth are far greater than those of any other nation. She is today the greatest military power in the world. She was this before she came into possession of the atomic bomb; more so today when she has this fabulously powerful weapon of war and is in position to use it. But her greatest influence and power in the world is due to her moral and spiritual ideals and principles—to her devotion to liberty, freedom, and the democratic way of life.

With this great power comes a correspondingly great responsibility to protect the world from suicidal war. This may be America's greatest obligation at the present time.

It is our obligation to use this power. Its non-use may be as fatal as its misuse. We followed the policy of its non-use after the First World War. This was a contributory cause of the Second World War. Bishop Dun of the Protestant Episcopal Church truly says: "Isolationism as a moral attitude is a sin in Christian terms. Before God, America's terrific power carries with it a terrific responsibility for the World Order." By our isolation policy we sinned grievously, but as a nation we have repented of this sin—at least turned away from it.

While we still have, under cover, an isolationist element, the American nation today accepts responsibility and is endeavoring to measure up to it.

Misuse of Our Power

But how are we using our power? We need to guard against using it in the wrong ways. To some extent we are doing this. In our efforts for peace we are relying too much upon our physical power—our military might—and not enough upon our moral and spiritual power. It has been said, we think truly, that in our diplomacy we appear to be relying upon fear—the big stick—as the most effective weapon for maintaining peace. We have an influential element in our country that believes our foreign policy should be based upon the inevitability or at least the strong probability, of another World War, and that we should proceed at once to prepare for it by building up a large military machine—a big army, a powerful navy, and an air force of overwhelming strength. This they assert, might prevent a war, and if not, it would insure our winning it. In fact we have those who would wage what they call a "preventative war" against Russia. We now have the atomic bomb, Russia does not yet have it, but soon will have it. Before she does, we should attack her and whale the life out of her. Suppose we do this and win. What then? We beat the Kaiser in World War I, but that didn't prevent World War II. Rather it planted the seeds for it. Nor will a Third World War bring peace. We couldn't shoot our ideals of liberty and freedom into Russia even with the atomic bomb.

But the awful destructiveness of another war waged with the atomic bomb as the chief weapon is too terrible even to contemplate. In such a war the victor as well as the vanquished would suffer irreparable loss.

What would be the effect upon the public mind in our own country were we, with our stock of atomic bombs, to wage a preventative war against Russia? Our people would revolt against it. What would be its effect upon the people of the world? We would lose every vestige of that moral and spiritual power which has been our great-

est hold upon the peoples of other lands, and in spite of all our professions, they would class us with those great empires of the past that have sought to rule the world by force.

But suppose we arm ourselves for defense only, and wait, as they say, for Russia, once she has the atomic bomb, to attack us. As shown elsewhere in this issue of *The Christian Statesman*, the changes this would necessitate in our American life would require the regimentation of our people to such an extent that little of the liberties we prize would be left, to say nothing of its prohibitive cost. Even with this, there is no assurance we could survive an atomic bomb attack, against which to date there is no known defense.

Right Use of Our Power

This will require that we place our reliance chiefly upon our moral and spiritual power, not upon our military strength. To do this the American people, especially our political leaders must be convinced of the *might of right*. What is needed above all else to bring peace is to put into practice between nations the simple but basic concepts of Christianity—righteousness and brotherly kindness. Let America do this, renouncing all self-seeking and self-aggrandizement, and she will build a public sentiment so strong not only for herself but for peace, that no opposing force can overcome it. Let there be less rattling of the sabre, less talk of war, and an outcry for peace. Let us refuse to consider war only as a *last resort* and then only in support of right.

How can we implement this policy in the present situation? Space will permit only brief mention of some of the more important ways:

I. By giving even more liberally than we have done, and sacrificially, of our abundance to feed and clothe the destitute in war ravished lands;

II. In most respects we think the so-called Marshall plan for the European Relief and Rehabilitation is a true and unexampled expression of the Christian spirit in international relationships—a gift of \$5,300,000,000 this first year (as the Senate has passed it) with more to follow;

III. By supporting and strengthening the United Nations. Apart from it, or an international organization of like character, peace cannot be attained. Therefore it should be maintained and made strong and effective as it is not as at present constituted.

Its two greatest handicaps should be removed by emending its Charter (a) to do away with the veto of Security Council action by any one of the five big powers; (b) to give the UN authority to enact and enforce law for the government of the 57 member nations in matters directly related to peace, and to enforce this law. This means the surrender of the nations of a part of national sovereignty. Let the United States take the lead in these matters and throw her full support back of the UN.

IV. With respect to Russia. We do not profess to know the solution, but we believe great restraint, patience and forbearance should be exercised with her. We should try to understand her point of view and not put the worst construction possible upon her actions as we are likely to do and be critical of our own.

We as private citizens cannot leave it to our public citizens to meet our responsibility for the peace of the world. We must do our part by keeping informed on these issues, building a right public sentiment for them and expressing that sentiment to our officials.

THE CHURCH'S RESPONSIBILITY FOR WORLD PEACE

In the crisis the world is facing today, the Church and Christian people have a tremendous responsibility for the abolition of war and the achieving of world peace. What is this responsibility and whence comes it?

War is waged and peace is declared by nations, as such. The Great Commission obligates the Church to give God's message to nations, "Go ye, disciple all nations, teaching them whatsoever I have commanded you."

The Church has been given, and is under obligation to proclaim and apply, those basic Christian principles which nations must accept and follow in their relations with each other to live peaceably together. Her responsibility is emphasized by the results of her failure to meet this responsibility. The leaders of the Church in Germany knew where Hitler was leading the nation, but they didn't interfere for they said it isn't the Church's business to meddle in politics. So they gave Hitler the green light. The results proved to be terrible.

Her responsibility is greatly increased by the terrible destructiveness of modern warfare. The atomic bomb has increased its destructiveness a thousand-fold. The abolition of war should now be a major objective of the Christian Church.

It is further increased by the urgent call of scientists and political leaders who are calling upon moral and religious leaders to come and take the leadership in the movement for peace, saying it will fail unless they do.

What are some of the things the Church can do in meeting this responsibility?

I. It should use its influence and power in opposing universal military training. This is not the solution of the problem. This issue is discussed elsewhere in this issue of *The Christian Statesman*.

II. It should proclaim and apply in the field of international relationships, the basic principles of Christianity—justice, righteousness and brotherly kindness. There is tremendous need of this in the present situation to overcome the self-seeking, dominating spirit that characterizes so much of the dealings of nations with each other.

Here is where the church and Christian leaders can render a great service to the cause of peace. Isaiah 32:17—"The work of righteousness shall be peace; and the effect of righteousness, quietness and confidence forever." Isaiah 9:6—"For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given; and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, Mighty God, Everlasting Father, Prince of Peace. Of the increase of his government and of peace there shall be no end."

III. It should exert its influence and power on behalf of a real, functioning world government. The establishment of civil governments and clothing it with authority to enact laws for the government of men, and power to enforce those laws is part of God's program for the human race. See Romans 13:1-6, where civil government is declared to be an ordinance of God. With the advance of civilization, this program has gone forward in establishing governments which have jurisdiction over the people within nations. Surely with the increasing communication, interrelationship and interdependence of nations, the time has come to set up a government over all the nations, invest it with authority to enact laws to

govern them in their relationships with each other and power to enforce these laws. This is in God's program for the world today. His church should do her utmost to see that his program is carried out. When the political leaders are saying, "Come, let us go up to the house of the Lord, learn of his ways, and follow in them." (see Isaiah 2:2-4), she should show them God's ways to peace.

The United Nations is the greatest forward step in this direction the nations have taken, but as shown in our article on "America's Responsibility" in this issue, it isn't far enough. It lacks the sovereignty required to enforce world law. Let us as churchmen and Christians insist upon America, instead of holding on to her national sovereignty, as a dog holds on to a bone, surrender that measure of sovereignty necessary to make the UN a real, functioning world government, and call upon the other nations to do the same. This would be a great step forward in the movement for world peace.

IV. With reference to more specific measures for peace. The Church and Christian people should take the lead in giving to the point of sacrifice of our abundance to relieve the hunger, destitution and suffering of the millions in Europe and the Far East who are the victims of the war. The so-called Marshall European Recovery Program in large measure at least should have supported.

V. While the Church and the Christians chief responsibility is in building public sentiment along the lines indicated above, they also have a responsibility in bringing that sentiment to bear upon our public officials at Washington and those who represent us in the councils of the United Nations. It is here that we Christians fail most of all. The great majority, an overwhelming majority of us, who have convictions on these matters never express them to those who represent us and determine our international policies. It is our duty to do so. All of us have some influence. In these crucial times and on this matter of peace, we should exert it to the utmost. It can be done by organizations by adopting resolutions and sending them in. *But it is far more effective to send personal letters.*

With reference to universal military training, we suggest you write your Congressman and Senators; concerning our international policies generally, the President, and Secretary of State, Hon. George C. Marshall, Washington, D. C. Concerning matters before the UN, Senator Warren R. Austin, U. S. Chief Delegate to the United Nations, addressing him, Office of the United States Delegation, 250 West 57th Street, New York City. Concerning amendments to the Charter of the UN, Senator Austin, the President and your Senators.

VI. The Church and we Christians have a further responsibility for world peace in making earnest and believing prayer on this whole matter of war and peace and especially for our national leaders at Washington and Lake Success, who carry tremendous responsibilities in determining our national policies with respect to the peace of the world. Most of these men are Christians. They feel the need of divine help. Some of them have specifically asked for the prayers of the people. Let us not disappoint them. (II Timothy 2:1-2).

The greatest responsibility for preventing another World War lies with the Church. May God help her and us who are Christians to measure up to this responsibility.

THE CHRISTIAN STATESMAN*Founded in 1867*

Devoted to Christian Political and Social Science

*Official Organ of***THE NATIONAL REFORM ASSOCIATION**

An organization of Christian citizens founded in 1863

*Published Bi-Monthly*January, March, May, July, September and November
at the Association's Headquarters, 209 Ninth St., Pittsburgh 19, Pa.

R. H. MARTIN, Editor-in-Chief

Rates, \$1.00 the year, payable in advance.

Entered as Second Class Matter, July 30, 1906 at Pittsburgh, Pa., under
Act of Congress of March 3, 1879.Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided in Section
1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized January 17, 1921.**OUR FIRST JOB**

"If you knew that down in the cellar of your house there is a hundred pounds of dynamite with a fuse of a certain length attached and lit, it is your main job to see that the beds are made and the cupboard is filled?" "At long last," says W. T. Holliday, President of the Standard Company of Ohio, in an article in the January, 1948 issue of Reader's Digest, "man has developed the instrument with which he can destroy his world, and will destroy it unless the power to do so is taken from him."

Even in its infancy the destructive power of the atomic bomb is terrible to contemplate. "Scientists," he says, "are already talking about bombs a hundred times more powerful than the Hiroshima type—that could blast New York off the face of the earth and kill 6,000,000 people. The first job of all of us today is to secure world peace. The only alternative is World War III."

Is he not right? In the present world situation should not the achieving of world peace have first place in our thoughts, efforts and prayers? This is why we are devoting this issue of *The Christian Statesman* largely to a discussion of this subject.

THE ATOMIC BOMB

Any realistic appraisal of the status of atomic energy today must be predicted upon two simple propositions: (1) There is no secret; (2) There is no defense. So says Robert M. Hutchins, Chancellor of the University of Chicago, in an article in the *American* (December, 1947) entitled, "The Bomb Secret Is Out."

In proof of the first proposition he says that before World War II, the fact was demonstrated "that atoms of certain substances, especially uranium could be split, and that this splitting, or fission was accompanied by the release of enormous quantities of energy." This, he says, was not an American secret. He names the scientists who pioneered in this preliminary work: only one was an American, the others were from Europe, five from Germany. Some of them came to our country, but now they are scattered throughout the world. They know all that is known about the process involved in producing the atomic bomb. The only problem remaining is that of capturing and controlling the atomic energy thus released. This is a manufacturing problem—a threefold problem of obtaining the materials, the machinery and manpower to produce the bomb. In this the United States took the lead. Even here the secret is out. No harm would have resulted had the whole enterprise been published in the newspapers for the simple reason only the United States had the physical resources to carry through such a monumental enterprise."

"Public utterances which would have us believe we own an atomic secret are rooted either in ignorance or conceit."

Concerning the second proposition—there is no defense against the atomic bomb, this educator and scientist says:

"Sixteen ounces of U. 235—the critical element in the atomic bomb—is capable of as much destruction as 8,000 tons of TNT. One medium sized bomb can wipe out of existence a target the size of Indianapolis."

The problem of attempting to destroy an atomic bomb on its way to a target when carried by a high speed missile, is as difficult as attempting to destroy an artillery shell in flight.

By reason of the concentration of our population in large cities and because our key industries are even more dangerously located, the U. S. is peculiarly vulnerable to atomic attack."

Fifty atomic explosions could paralyze this nation's war-making powers; 93 well-placed missiles could subject nearly one-half the American people to atomic bombing in a single attack.

"Is there a solution?" Dr. Hutchins asks.

"Our only salvation lies in establishment of an international morality, a mutual acceptance of the futility of further warfare, and a mutual avowal to keep the peace. Three years ago I would have considered such a thought absurd. Today I believe it is the only chance for the survival of humanity. . . . Perhaps the practical solution is the establishment of a world government. I am convinced we must try to attain it within the next five years."

THE ATHEIST WINS

On March 8th the U. S. Supreme Court handed down an astounding decision which if carried to its logical conclusion would bar all religion from our public schools and make them as godless as the schools of Communistic Russia. It was the Champaign, Illinois case in which a professed atheist appealed to the local court to require the school board to discontinue classes in religious instruction in the public school buildings once a week. She was turned down by the local court; on appeal, by the State Supreme Court; and then appealed to the U. S. Supreme Court.

While different views are held as to how far this decision goes, all are agreed it is a body-blow struck at the great cause of moral and religious education in our public schools. We withhold extended discussion on it until the next issue of *The Christian Statesman* for two reasons: we do not have access to the full opinions of all the Judges and we promised our readers that this issue of *The Christian Statesman* would be devoted to the pressing issue of world peace.

Briefly we will say this now—the decision rests chiefly upon a misinterpretation of our American doctrine of the separation of church and state. "The wall of separation between church and state" does not mean that the state is religion-less, godless, atheistic. Our state has stamped "In God we Trust" on its coins, employs and pays for the service of chaplains in Congress and State Legislatures, and in many other ways recognizes and teaches religion.

Second, let the justices protest as they will, keeping religious instruction out of the public schools is antagonistic to religion. By ignoring religion and God, the State by example, would teach the youth either that religion and God do not exist or, if they do, that they are not of sufficient importance in the training of our youth to receive any consideration.

Third, such a course followed would undermine the religious foundations of our liberty and democracy.

This decision must not be allowed to stand. We predict it will arouse nation-wide agitation and opposition and be reversed.

ON SACRIFICE—By Roger W. Babson

Two weeks ago there appeared in my newsletter a copy of a letter which I had sent to my grandchildren. Since then something has happened.

Of my grandchildren, only two have been boys. One of these is artistic and has no interest in business; he was in the service and returned from Europe safely. The other, Michael, has been much interested in business, one with whom I have discussed my affairs although only eighteen years old. He has been working at a Sunapee, N. H., hotel all summer; last week took a speed boat party out on Lake Sunapee.

Somehow one of the girls fell overboard. Michael stopped the boat and dove in after her, knowing that she could not swim. He succeeded in dragging her to the side of the boat so that the others could pull her in. This they did; but Michael was exhausted and sank to the bottom. Divers are trying to recover his body. It was a splendid way to go and I am much prouder of him than if he had lived and made a million dollars.

But why do I tell my personal troubles to you clients? There are two reasons: First, because it has brought trouble home to me and makes me appreciate human values. It is the first blow which I personally have had since my sister was drowned here at Gloucester many years ago. I lost no near kin in either World War I or II. War fatalities were only cold statistics to me. This is the first time I have appreciated what these 350,000 families really suffered and what one thousand other families are experiencing every day of every year.

During my career I have studied only profits, wages, bushels, and tons. Friends, I fear there are too many other American businessmen who are like me—*forgetting the human values*. This may explain why we do not understand the millions of wageworkers whose only assets are their boys and girls. Today I am trying to think of them and also of the millions of starving families in Europe who love their children just as much as I loved Michael.

My second reason for mentioning Michael is to apologize for my habit of discussing World War III as though the money cost and property damage are of primary consideration. Heretofore, I have figured which is the cheaper in dollars—to help out Europe now or to fight now. I have not considered the millions of good boys who would be killed in another war. Again I fear there are too many other businessmen—and perhaps labor leaders too—who are as ruthless as I have been in thinking too much of the dollars involved and not enough of the human lives. Anyhow, I am a changed man today. *I shall henceforth devote my time to working for more peace rather than for fewer taxes.*

Just one more thought: Of course, if World War III comes, we will be told that it is a fight for "democracy against dictatorship." But since losing Michael, I have been wondering if there is not a more underlying reason for today's world troubles. *May not our emphasis on property, stocks, profits, and wages be one reason why America may become the target of the struggling masses of Europe and Asia? If we would be willing to sacrifice our wealth—in a big way—perhaps even Russia would have to call off her gangster program.*

This does not mean that we should pay tribute, as a cowardly nation, to Europe; but that *we would achieve peace with wheat, livestock, and machinery instead of with sons and grandsons. We, however, cannot accomplish such without making real sacrifices. It would temporarily require farmers to forgo profits, investors to forgo dividends, and all of us to work ten hours a day for army wages. The only way Communism may be licked is by our accepting, for a while, a lower standard of living. The question is whether we will do this voluntarily in order to raise sufficiently the European standard; or*

will we still insist on fighting the most destructive war imaginable?

In either case it would mean a great sacrifice and apparent setback for America. *Before losing my grandson, I was all for fighting Russia now and "cleaning the mess up"; but today I think there may be a better way. Besides, do wars ever settle great questions when ideologies are involved.*—(Reprinted in "Christian Laymen" from a newsletter Mr. Babson, well known business man, sent to his clients.)

THE UNITED NATIONS

It is all but universally conceded that if the United Nations goes down a Third World War is inevitable. To bring an end to war, another and effective means of settling their quarrels must be found. The only other method that can be effective—all others have failed—is by establishing an international or world political organization, and referring their controversies to it for peaceable adjudication. But it will be said, is being said, the United Nations is such an organization and it has failed. While it has accomplished much (and it is still in its infancy) it is true that it is inadequate, unable to meet the present situation. But not because the method or plan is wrong, but because as at present constituted it is functioning under handicaps too great to overcome. Its chief handicaps are two in number:

(1) The veto power of the Security Council. To this Council, not to the General Assembly, matters directly relating to the peace of the world are referred under the Charter, and the Council's action is final. The Council is composed of eleven members, five permanent members representing the five big countries, United States, Great Britain, Russia, France and China, the remaining six representing smaller states, are changeable. Action by the Council to be effective must have the support of all the big state members. A negative vote by any one of them nullifies any action they may take, even though it has the support of the other ten. This has proved to be a tremendous handicap. Russia has blocked nearly every important action the Council sought to take on behalf of world peace. Of the 24 times the veto was exercised to veto action up to last October, Russia was responsible for 23. The Charter must be changed to remove this handicap.

(2) But it has still another and more fundamental handicap; it lacks authority and power to enact laws for the government of the 57 member nations in their relation to each other that are binding on them, and the power to enforce these laws. Even with the United Nations we still have anarchy in the international realm. The United Nations is only a league of nations with all the weaknesses of the confederacy of our early history before we established the Federal Government. It cannot become a *real government*, with authority and power to enact and enforce law, until the member states surrender that portion of their national sovereignty which the United Nations must have to function effectively in the international realm. Let these handicaps be removed and the UN can become an effective instrument for world peace. Provision is made in the Charter for making these and other needed changes-amendments. Two-thirds of the nations can call a convention for this purpose and by a two-thirds vote they can adopt and submit these amendments to the nations. And if two-thirds of the nations adopt them, they would have enough for an effective and powerful government. But what of Russia? If she decides not to go along, let her and her satellites withdraw. She would be able to do far less harm outside than she is doing now within the UN.

If this is to be accomplished America must take the lead as her President took the lead in establishing the League of Nations and as our nation took the lead in establishing the United Nations.

ASSOCIATION ACTIVITIES

On October 3, 1947, Mrs. R. H. Martin, wife of the Editor of *The Christian Statesman* and President of the National Reform Association, was taken to the Presbyterian Hospital, Pittsburgh, Pa., with what soon proved to be a serious and fatal illness. Notwithstanding the best of medical care and nursing, she gradually grew worse and passed to her heavenly home eleven weeks later, on December 20th. While much of Dr. Martin's time was given to visiting the hospital and otherwise looking after the welfare of Mrs. Martin, he was able to spend most of each day in the office, carrying forward the Association's work. Since the first of last November he has spoken in numerous congregations of the Reformed Presbyterian Churches in the Pittsburgh district, and several in Michigan, Ohio and Philadelphia. The Synod of this church recommends that an offering for The National Reform cause be taken in each of its congregations once each year. This offering is usually taken where Dr. Martin speaks following his message. He reports that the offerings this year have been more liberal than in the past. At this writing (March 10th) he is spending a week in Atlantic City recuperating and doing some writing.

* * *

A very considerable portion of time was given by members of the staff of The National Reform Association to an examination of the 52 issues of "Life" and "Time," and the 12 issues of "Fortune" for 1947—all published by Time, Inc., to find the number of liquor advertisements in each, and revenue derived from these advertisements. The results are found elsewhere in this issue. While this work is done for The National Temperance and Prohibition Council by Dr. Martin, Chairman of the Council's Committee Against Liquor Advertising, it is done by members of The National Reform staff on National Reform time and very largely at National Reform expense. It is a contribution the Association makes and is glad to make to the temperance cause in America.

MR. HERTZLER'S BIBLE IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS WORK

During the past month or more our fieldman has been working in parts of Central Indiana, Southwestern Ohio, and Western Pennsylvania. In Indiana he worked in Decatur, Wabash, Elwood, North Manchester, New Castle, Richmond and Bluffton. In all of these cities there is apparent a keen interest in Weekday Religious Education work, and it appears as though such work will be definitely started in at least three of the cities mentioned. A very interesting meeting was pre-arranged in Wabash, Ind. The Ministerial Association had called a meeting for all persons interested to meet with the fieldman to discuss the methods of procedure in organizing such a program. A group of some 20 persons representing pastors, county Sunday School Association, Parent-Teachers' Association, and others responded. The meeting was conducted as a forum discussion which proved to evoke a very interesting and helpful inter-change of ideas regarding the whole phase of Weekday Religious Education. Those present decided to call a city-wide mass meeting very soon after Easter to acquaint the people of Wabash more fully with the need, purpose, and values of a weekday program. They have requested that Mr. Hertzler be the speaker and forum leader for that mass meeting. On Sabbath, February 1, Mr. Hertzler spoke at the morning and evening services of the Muncie Church of the Brethren.

Mr. Hertzler attended the annual meeting of the International Council of Religious Education, held at Grand Rapids, Mich., February 8-11, in order to become better acquainted with the latest trends and emphasis in religious education, especially in the field of weekday work. The sessions were interesting, informative, and particularly

highlighted the current stress put upon the legal aspects of the Weekday Religious Education movement.

Another extended trip was made through southern and southwestern Ohio, including Urbana, Piqua, Troy, Middletown, Eaton, Hamilton, Batavia, Georgetown, Lebanon and Wilmington. This trip was made because of requests from several cities for some help in their problems in administering weekday programs. At least one new program will be started as the result of these visits, several new teachers will be required in this part of Ohio, and some curriculum changes were advised. While in this part of the state the fieldman also visited the cities of Cincinnati and Dayton to consult with the supervisors of those cities about new curricular materials.

Recently the fieldman made a trip to Western Pennsylvania. He spoke at the services of the Church of the Brethren, New Paris, Pa., on Sunday, February 29. He visited in Altoona, Tyrone, Bellwood and Huntingdon, in endeavoring to stimulate interest in Weekday Religious Education work for those communities. In Huntingdon, Mr. Hertzler spent some time on the campus of Juniata College soliciting interest among the students as prospective teachers in this field. Mr. Hertzler spent two days in Pittsburgh, consulting with Dr. Martin and some of the members of the board of directors. He also did some work in Washington, Pa., and spoke at the morning and evening services of the First Christian Church in Charleroi, Pa., on March 7. On Monday, March 8, Mr. Hertzler addressed the Methodist Minister's meeting of the Pittsburgh area, speaking on the subject, "Is Weekday Religious Education Constitutional?"

NATIONAL REFORM ASSOCIATION SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA BRANCH

While we have not made a spectacular growth, yet our paid-up membership has more than doubled in the little more than two years since this Branch was organized. Beginning with July, 1947, we have employed the Rev. David Calderwood, Th.D., as field representative. He has given on an average approximately two lectures a week in churches, Bible Schools, Men's Clubs, Ministerial Associations, Teachers' Institutes, etc., on the need for and importance of the return of the Bible to its rightful place in the public schools of our nation. The specific objective is to seek to create public sentiment in support of a bill to authorize the reading of the Bible in the public schools of the State of California. To that end we are seeking the cooperation of the Gideons, the American Legion, the W.C.T.U. and the Christian Business men's organization. Dr. Calderwood has met with an enthusiastic response on the part of the people when once he can get past the preachers.

To furnish material for this program of education we have had printed 5,000 copies of a folder telling of proposed legislation to authorize the reading of the Bible in our public schools. This folder has been revised and another 5,000 copies printed. We also printed another folder telling of the origin and nature of the National Reform Movement. In addition we published 2,000 copies of the book, "The Bible Indispensable in Education," by S. M. Ellis, which has been widely distributed.

During 1947 the president gave sixteen lectures on the Christian Amendment. Our annual meeting and Christian Citizenship Rally was held November 7 in the United Presbyterian Church, Santa Ana, the Rev. DeWitt Safford pastor. In December a letter with material on the Bible in our schools was sent to some 400 ministers in the state. In January another letter to some 200 pastors was sent.

Gifford Gordon, nationally known temperance advocate, and speaker to the youth of the nation, gave considerable publicity to the work of our Association in his radio talks over station KGER in Long Beach, Calif. We have estab-

lished contact with the Secretary of the Commission appointed by the State Legislature to prepare a revised draft of the State Constitution to be submitted to the people at a later time. He has secured for us a hearing before that body on March 20th.

In order to put our work on a permanent basis we feel that it is necessary, in the not too distant future, to employ an office secretary. We could start with one on a part-time basis. An earnest Christian woman, qualified to do secretarial work, may be found who is in a position to give some time to the work of the office. The expenditures for necessary printing stationery, postage, travel, support of a part-time field representative, the rent of an office and the salary of a part-time office secretary, will call for regular contributions from quite a number of people over and above the membership fees. This is a call to the Lord's intercessors to undergird this movement with prayer, and bring these needs before our Lord at the throne of grace.

We have in preparation two brochures, one on "The State and the Bible," and the other on "When Education Rejects Revelation," for widespread distribution throughout the state.

THE PRESENT CRISIS

By Rev. H. B. Mansell

A turning point in history marks the year 1945. The effort of the Axis powers to secure control of humanity by physical force collapsed—enough to mark any year. But the destruction of two cities by just two atomic bombs begins some kind of new age. This new physical power is so destructive that the scientists are terrified by its possibilities. They all declare it is an offensive weapon against which there is no possible defense. Further they assert that it is impossible long to retain the secret. And most significantly it is the scientists who proclaim that moral and spiritual controls are the hope if civilization is to be preserved.

So interdependent for raw materials are the nations of the world and so closely are they knit together by airplanes, radio, and commerce that they can no longer live in isolation. Hence the imperative need for international controls. When the cities of Greece did not unite, but formed two hostile leagues, Athens and Sparta led them to a mutual destruction of their liberties. When Rome had conquered the then civilized world the form of her government was continued by Julius Caesar while he held the substance of power. That passed to his successors, but the Roman people had lost the virtues that had made Rome great. The barbarians seized the empire. All that Caesar left was the idea of rule by kaisers, czars, and various forms of monarchy. The rule of men was counted more effective than the rule of law.

Only slowly through centuries did men come to think that any law could be binding on rulers. Six score years ago our forefathers providentially adopted a Federal Constitution based on the belief that rulers should be bound by laws based on the will of the governed. This federal experiment was made with much fear. A change of less than five per cent of the vote in each of four state conventions would have defeated the adoption of a constitution which Gladstone, the English statesman, affirmed was "the greatest single document ever struck off, at one time, by any body of men." A new day in history had dawned. Thirteen sovereign states had accepted a document establishing laws higher than their sovereign rights. In that time the rules of men by the divine right of birth, declared a nation so established could not be strong and would not survive. But it has survived.

Twice within a half century this form of government has been tried in the fierce flames of world-wide wars. The believers of government by force found it too strong

to be overthrown by them. During 160 years it has been in existence and people have seen the kaisars, czars, rulers and dukes of force dethroned, save where they have been wise enough to allow the real power of government to rest with the chosen representatives of their peoples. Call the roll of the great nations of the world and they will be found to have established some form of a federal union; the same is true of most of the lesser nations.

The League of Nations was a recognition of the need for a Federal World Government. But America was not ready; we lacked the daring of our forefathers. Nor were other nations willing to give such a government real authority. The Covenant of the League was like the Articles of Confederation that the Constitutional Fathers found utterly insufficient for the needs of our country. So also, it seems, the Charter of the United Nations does not grant effective power to that organization. It cannot enact laws binding upon the signatory peoples; it has no definite police powers to bring violators, either persons or nations, to a bar of judgment.

A hundred years ago, during the controversy over the Mexican War, Lowell wrote:

"New occasions teach new duties,
Time makes ancient good uncouth,
They must upward still and onward
Who would keep abreast of truth."

A short generation ago we did not heed this voice. We must never again "Attempt the future's portal with past's blood-rusted key."

Earl Haig, British general of World War I, aptly said: "It is the business of the church to make my business impossible."

The atomic scientists now say that only through the teachings of Jesus is there possible safety in this new age. Here is the challenge facing all Christians. God, in His providence, has been preparing for this time. During the past two centuries His missionaries have penetrated the whole world. This year there has been a striking example of what that can mean.

India has secured her independence though divided into two states—Hindustan and Moslem Pakistan. The result has been strife between the native religions, an exchange of ten million people, death and suffering to tens of thousands. In their distress both of these non-Christian states, through their governments, appealed to the National Christian Council of India for help. The Christians were the only group that Hindus, Moslems and Sikhs alike would trust to be fair. The denominations formed a National Christian Relief Committee which quickly organized into subcommittees, surveyed needs and drew up plans. The head, an American missionary, cabled a list of medical and other needs to America. The day following supplies were on the way to India by airplanes. Such are the possibilities that face Christians today.

In his recent book, "God Confronts Man In History," Dr. Henry Sloane Coffin tells of meeting an old Chinese man 30 years ago in Peking. The man was a secretary to the then president of the Republic of China. He spoke of his reading the Chinese sages and added that he also frequently read the teachings of Jesus. He went on to say:

"I have asked myself what seems His distinctive quality?" Then he replied to his own query:

"He seems to have the power to create a more delicate conscience." That is what the world needs today, "a more delicate conscience." Jesus has that creative power with men. Crucified, dead, buried he was; yet now centuries later He has power. Caesar, and all his like, who trusted in the sword have perished with the sword. If America trusts in the destructive power of the atom bomb we will perish with the atom bomb. In his infinite mercy we have a second chance to lead humanity into a new age; let us use it.

MILITARY USURPATION

By DELBER H. ELLIOTT

The determined effort to thrust Universal Military Training upon us presents a serious threat to democratic America. It would mean peace-time militarization of the nation. There come times when war is thrust upon us and we have the alternative to fight or submit to tyranny. When that time comes force must be met with force. We do not object to a sane program of preparedness for our national safeguard.

But we do protest against becoming a military nation trained in the psychology of war, which thinks war, talks war and plans war. UMT follows the logic of war rather than the logic of peace. What we object to is the militarization of America.

Military Invasion

There is an alarming tendency on the part of the military to invade the citadels of our democratic life. While we concede that there is a place for the exercise of military power, we will never consent to its becoming a way of life. We do not want it, in time of peace, to become a part of our civil and domestic institutions. We honor and respect our policemen as long as they operate in their assigned sphere. But what would we think if they would undertake to mold the policies of our homes and schools and institutions of civil government. We call attention to a few of the propensities of military government.

Monetary Conscription

Our federal budget for 1947 was 39 billion dollars, of which 12½ billion, or about 32 per cent, went to the support of our army, navy and coast guard. Eight billion more was appropriated for related military agencies, making a total military expenditure of more than 20 billion, or 54 per cent of the total budget. The appropriation for the 1948 military budget is about 66 per cent of the total budget for the nation.

Family Invasion

UMT will forcibly enter our homes and take our young men from the ages of 17 to 20 and put them under military control. The total military force of the U. S. is placed at one and a half million men, the largest in peace-time history. In addition the army contemplates a National Guard of 700,000 and an Organized Reserve of a million more. Under the UMT program an additional one million boys will enter military service each year to remain for a period of three years. As this continues, approximately 5 million will be regularly under military instruction in the art of war.

Much is being said about the great value of military training to our youth. The military powers have yet to prove that they have a better system of ennobling character than that established by the home. Lifting the restraints of the family usually results in lowered morality. Ask any pastor whose young men came back from World War II, how many of them returned morally better than when they went away. It is true that thousands stood the test in spite of their environment. But tens of thousands learned to drink and gamble and contracted other evil habits which they did not have when they went away.

Governmental Encroachment

There is a national trend that threatens to place the powers of government in military hands. An increasing number of military men are occupying governmental positions. President Truman's personal aid is William D. Leahy, General George C. Marshall is Secretary of State and his first assistant is Brig. Gen. Marshall S. Carter. Other military men are ambassadors to Russia, Belgium, Panama and South Africa.

The U. S. News of March 21, 1947, said: "Never before have the Army and Navy been so powerfully placed in government controls." *The New York Times* on May 8, 1947, stated that when General John H. Hildring was

made an assistant secretary of state, "He brought with him to the State Department 26 of his assistants in the War Department." *The Washington Star* of February 2, 1947, said: "Ten of the men ranking as executive officers in the State Department have been brought in during recent months from the military service."

Scientific Pervasion

Military influence is gaining large control in the field of science. *Business Week* of September 14, 1947, contained this statement: "Partly by design, partly by default, federal support of pure science is today almost completely under military control. . . . The odds are getting better all the time that pure scientific research will become permanently a branch of the military establishment."

Educational Infiltration

The military is also reaching into the schools and colleges. *The Washington Daily News* of November 7, 1947, stated that the Army is surveying the nation's school system and that military men have proposed a registration plan for boys and girls, from 15 years old and up, with a view to emergency duty.

Military Futility

Since we have moved into an age of atomic bombs and biological warfare, will not the old methods of military training be as outmoded as a last year's bird nest? Military men themselves tell us that the next war will not be fought by tanks and guns and marching armies. Rather we are warned that it will be waged by planes laden with atom bombs and death-dealing germs. It is conceded that, if our enemies do not possess the knowledge of the bomb, they are certain to have it in a few short years at most and in hands which will not be scruple to use it. A war thus fought may be won or lost within a week, a day or possibly an hour.

If all the youth of the nation are trained according to the customs of the past, of what value will such training be? All former methods have been by-passed by new inventions of mass destruction. How often are we reading statements like this? "They have developed a weapon that can wipe out all forms of life in a large city. It is a germ proposition and is sprayed from airplanes that can fly high enough to be free from ground fire."

After an enemy country has been sprayed with germs or radio-active materials, it would be fatal for an invading army to enter. Besides what would be left for invading troops to do? We wonder too, after a ware like that, what could be left that would be worth living for? Even though we "win" we all will lose.

Military Sanity

One of America's great needs is a military which will subordinate material force to moral character; which will follow the logic of peace instead of the logic of war; which will aim to build rather than to destroy; which will be willing that ideas and ideals that are materialistic in their concept shall be reinforced by ideas and ideals that are moral and spiritual; whose consuming passion will be, not a nation devoted to military might, but a nation dedicated to the truth that "Righteousness exalteth a nation, but sin is a reproach to any people."

This article is not written by a pacifist nor by a disciple of appeasement at any price. He believes that there are times when nations must wage war in the interest of right. But he also believes that the whole military system needs rethinking and reshaping, so that it will merit the respect, approval and support of The Prince of Peace. Only with Him will we go forth conquering and to conquer.

"It is not by might, nor by power, but by my spirit, saith the Lord of Hosts."